

BIO 210 Milestone Three: Peer Review Guidelines and Rubric

Overview: Submit a draft of your final PowerPoint presentation based on the information that you identified in Milestones One and Two to the discussion board to be reviewed by your fellow classmates. You will also provide a review for at least two other classmates' draft presentations. Use the critical element information in the final project document for your evaluations. The purpose of this peer review in this course is not only to help your classmate to improve his or her presentation, but to strengthen your own critical-thinking abilities by providing constructive reviews of others' work. The basis of your response is evaluated for the critical elements described below and in the grading rubric. Remember, this rubric assesses **your** performance in this activity, not the material of your peers. **This milestone will be submitted in Module Five.**

Specifically, the following critical elements must be addressed:

1. **Strengths:** Provide feedback on the strengths of the peer's presentation, explaining your reasoning using specific and relevant details.
2. **Improvements:** Provide feedback on aspects of the peer's presentation that could be improved, using a positive tone and providing concrete suggestions.
3. **Responses to classmate presentation:** Respond to questions or comments from your peers on your review of their work.
4. **Responses to own presentation:** Respond to the reviews of your own presentation, asking for clarification and/or answering questions and specifically addressing comments.
5. In Module Five, complete the initial post by Thursday at 11:59 p.m. of your local time zone. Complete the two response posts by Sunday 11:59 p.m. of your local time zone.

As a reviewer:

1. Take the time to review the presentation thoroughly. Refer to the final project document to confirm whether or not your classmate has addressed the requirements of the assignment.
2. You are critiquing the work, not the person. The critique should start with the strengths of the work. What works and why?
Example of a good critique: "The presentation captured my attention with the images used. The diagrams were clear and well-labeled."
Example of a bad critique: "I liked Jason's style."
3. Suggest any areas for revision to improve these areas. Keep the tone positive and provide concrete suggestions for improvement.
Example of a good critique: "For improvement, I suggest increasing the font size and limiting the number of images on one slide."
Example of a bad critique: "The format needs fixing. It was so confusing I did not understand anything about the organ system."

As the author:

1. Read your classmates' comments carefully, avoiding any desire to defend your work. What does each reviewer like about your work, and what does each reviewer think you should revise?
2. Pay particular attention to points where several of your reviewers agree with one another. What strengths or weaknesses do your reviewers see that you might have missed, and how might you revise your work to play to your strengths?

3. If you are unclear what a particular reviewer means, ask him or her to clarify. For example, “Pat, can you be more specific in describing what confused you about the points I made on homeostatic interactions?”
4. If you have any questions after reading a classmate’s comments, feel free to ask your peers for a second opinion, but do not do so in a defensive manner. You might ask, “Do you feel the sources were appropriate? Because of the weaknesses Chris noticed, I am concerned whether the supporting details I provided were too general. How could the details be more specific?”
5. Thank your classmates for their feedback, and address any questions that they may have asked of your work.
6. Remember, it is your work. Your peers may have approached the same topic differently; however, do not just dismiss suggestions out of hand, especially if multiple reviewers point to similar problems.

Example: Several reviewers suggest that your information was not supported by any references.

Rubric

Guidelines for Submission: Provide an organized list of comments for each of your reviews, addressing the critical elements for the presentations for at least two of your classmates. Select presentations that do not yet have a review or have the fewest reviews. Reply to at least two different classmates addressing any comments or questions your peers may pose to you on your own work.

Critical Elements	Exemplary	Proficient	Needs Improvement	Not Evident	Value
Feedback on Strengths of Peer Work	Meets “Proficient” criteria and uses concrete and specific details from the peer’s presentation (100%)	Identifies places in which peers were successful, explaining reasoning (85%)	Vaguely identifies places in which peers were successful but without explaining reasoning (55%)	Does not identify places in which peers were successful (0%)	20
Feedback on Areas for Improvement for Peer Work	Meets “Proficient” criteria and focuses constructively and specifically on the aspects of the presentation, not the person (100%)	Provides concrete suggestions for areas that need improvement using a positive tone (85%)	Provides vague suggestions for areas that need improvement and/or tone is not constructive (55%)	Does not provide concrete suggestions for areas that need improvement (0%)	20
Engagement in Questions or Comments from Peers	Meets “Proficient” criteria and provides concrete and specific feedback (100%)	Offers feedback on questions or comments from his or her peers (85%)	Offers vague or generic feedback on questions or comments from his or her peers (55%)	Does not offer feedback on questions or comments from his or her peers (0%)	20

Southern New Hampshire University

Engagement in Response Posts to Peer Reviews of own Work	Meets “Proficient” criteria and using concrete and specific details for clarification or how his or her own presentation will be modified (100%)	Provides clear responses to questions posed on own presentation using relevant details (85%)	Does not clearly respond using relevant details responses to questions posed on own presentation (55%)	Does not respond to questions posed on own presentation (0%)	20
Timeliness		Submits initial post on time (100%)	Submits initial post one day late (55%)	Submits initial post two or more days late (0%)	20
Total					100%